

(3)

LANGUAGE PROGRAM PROGRESS REPORT

On 3 November the Director of Training summarized for Mr. Dulles and his Senior Staff Meeting the Agency's progress to date in the Language Development Program. Highlights of his report will be of interest to readers everywhere.

"CIA has scored first in the development of a large scale but workable program of monetary incentives for the achievement and maintenance of language proficiency", he said. [REDACTED] have paid bonus stipends for language proficiency, on a small scale, to a few. The Soviets probably are paying language bonuses also, but CIA is undoubtedly first in the domestic field."

25X1C

This program was launched officially on 4 February 1957, when Mr. Dulles gave final approval to a proposal which had been in discussion and planning stages for over two years. Language training has been conducted in the Agency since its beginning, and hundreds of people have studied languages at posts abroad, but the initiation of this program marked our first systematic effort to encourage widespread achievement and maintenance of needed language proficiencies, stressing the voluntary participation of all employees.

Our emphasis on the voluntary aspects of the program is still unique, and it is in its voluntary features that the greatest progress has been made. As of 1 November we had taught 1035 students in 190 courses, in 17 different languages, all during non-duty hours. 91 Agency staff employees had volunteered to work overtime as language instructors, and another 20 as test developers, in connection with the program. And you will recall that the awards for language learning achieved voluntarily on the individual's own time are twice the amounts paid for achievement during duty hours.

A quantitative measure of progress to date is reflected in the following statistics. (For comparative purposes two sets of dates are used: the 12-month period preceding the start of the program, 4 February 1956 to 4 February 1957; and the most recent 12-month period, 1 November 1957 to 1 November 1958; indicated below as 1957 and 1958.)

This document is part of an integrated file. If separated from the file it must be subjected to individual systematic review.

FIGURE 1

	<u>1957</u>	<u>1958</u>
Total students in all Hq. language training	590	1545
Total number of courses conducted	144	306
Number of languages studied	27	31

FIGURE 2

The 1545 students in 1958 were distributed as follows:

a.	<u>MALE</u>			<u>FEMALE</u>		
	923			622		
	DDI	DDP	DDS	DDI	DDP	DDS
	248	494	181	178	373	71

b.	<u>PROFESSIONALS (GS 7-18)</u>			<u>CLERICALS (GS 1-6)</u>		
	1239			306		
	DDI	DDP	DDS	DDI	DDP	DDS
	356	670	213	70	197	39

c. Of the 1239 Professionals:

	<u>JUNIORS (GS 7-12)</u>			<u>SENIORS (GS 13-18)</u>		
	1018			221		
	DDI	DDP	DDS	DDI	DDP	DDS
	294	544	180	62	126	33

d. 1545 students by type of instruction:

Internal - 1416
 External - 129 (Including 6 full-time students overseas)

SECRET

d. 1545 students by type of instruction: (con't)

Directed Study - 684
Voluntary Study - 861

e. 1545 students in 31 languages studied:

TOTAL

DIRECTED STUDY

25X1A

A significant and increasingly important adjunct of the Language Development Program is the Language Qualifications Register. Through the combined efforts of the Office of Personnel and the Registrar of OTR, Agency management can now obtain accurate and timely information on the language skills of the Agency. We can tell you, often within a matter of minutes, who and how many have what degree of skill in what languages, and where they are. Or we can answer such questions as: who can speak Mandarin Chinese? Who can teach tradecraft in French? What languages can employee "X" translate? Is either A or B fluent in Spanish? How recently were they tested?

As of 1 November approximately 80% of all Agency employees had filed a Language Data Record, Form 444c, for inclusion in the Register, and about 60% of these claimed some degree of competence in a total of 113 languages. Of these claiming competence, 1346 had been tested as of 1 November, in 34 languages. Results of the testing program to date show a very gratifying correlation between claimed skills and tested

skills, but our goal is a Language Qualifications Register which will include all Agency personnel, and which will be based entirely on tested skills. Then personnel assignment planners will have an invaluable service at their disposal.

It is noteworthy that the program as developed to date has been achieved at a modest fraction of the cost originally estimated. In fact, the current level of costs, projected through Fiscal Year 1959, is roughly 10% of the figure which was approved at the outset by the Career Council. There appear to be three major reasons for this tremendous saving.

First, the program has been an outstanding team effort. Volunteer instructors from throughout the Agency have made it possible to do internally much of what we had budgeted to do externally at the Foreign Service Institute, Georgetown University, and elsewhere, and OTR has not added a single position to its language teaching faculty. Similarly, the development of tests in 39 languages was achieved largely by Agency employees, with minimal outside assistance costing less than 5% of the amount originally estimated.

25X1A Second, the numbers of staff employees who have requested the kinds of language training we had planned for have been far fewer than expected. For example, it was anticipated that 100 staff employees annually would be engaged in full time language training abroad -- a goal set for us by General Cabell. We have six, five from FE and a Junior Officer Trainee at [REDACTED] In the past year we have cancelled 11 intensive language courses and 32 part time courses in the duty-hours program because of insufficient enrollment, and 26 other courses have been conducted with an enrollment at or below the desired minimum number of students. Students who were scheduled originally for full or part time duty-hours courses were shifted to non-duty-hours voluntary courses; this in spite of the fact, attested by experience, that intensive study of a language is the best way by far to attain useful fluency.

Third, the cost of achievement and maintenance awards has been far less than anticipated. Original estimates were based upon an analysis of the self-declared language proficiencies listed by staff employees in their Personal History Statements. The Language Data

Record, Form 444c, which warned of tests to come, has proved to be a source of far more accurate data than the old PHS, and employees simply have not qualified for awards in the numbers expected. As of 1 November, 839 awards had gone to 575 people in 25 languages, at a total cost of \$101,350.

The foregoing account shows gratifying progress in which the Agency can take just pride. Generally speaking, the right people are studying languages in increasing numbers, and the Agency's aggregate competence is gradually increasing at modest cost. However, viewed qualitatively, the record to date affords no grounds for complacency. We must ask ourselves whether we are giving enough people the right kind of training in the right languages to meet effectively our responsibilities as a professional intelligence service. For example, as noted above, of a total of 1545 students, 684 are pursuing directed studies in the intensive and semi-intensive duty-hours programs. Of these, 310 are studying nine of the ten Group I languages, but 289

etc. ? The figures appear impressive, but in practice we still experience difficulty in staffing many positions with persons having the desired competence.

These data suggest that we still have a long way to go in tooling up personnel qualifications to the levels the Agency should possess. It is for operating officials to determine the specific needs which exist; the Office of Training, through the Language Development Program, will do all possible to meet them. It is hoped that the present momentum of the program will continue, and that all employees will be encouraged to take advantage of the unique opportunities it affords, to their own and the Agency's advantage.

25X1A

TRANSMITTAL SLIP		DATE 2 November 1958
TO: [REDACTED]		
ROOM NO. 122	BUILDING East Bldg.	
REMARKS: <i>In the <u>Support Bulletin</u>. If we run this at all in the OTH Bulletin, it will not be before the January issue.</i>		
FROM: [REDACTED]		
ROOM NO. 11	BUILDING T-31	EXTENSION 3521

FORM NO. 241
1 FEB 55

REPLACES FORM 36-8
WHICH MAY BE USED.

(47)

25X1A